

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16 and 18-31 are now presented for examination. Claims 20, 24 and 28 have been amended. Claims 1, 8, 14, 20, 24 and 28 are the independent claims.

Claims 20-22, 24-26 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,812,688 (Gibson). Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-15, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Gibson in view of U.S. Patent 6,459,797 (Ashour).

Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8, 14, 20, 24 and 28 are patentable for at least the following reasons. The amendments to claims 20, 24 and 28 are supported at least by the “initial delay” described at page 8, lines 10-17.

A noteworthy feature of the present according to independent claim 1 is that an image is displayed variably depending upon the distance between the sound source and the listener.

The Office Action took the position that Gibson discloses that the image display variably displays image data depending on the value of the parameter reflecting the distance characteristic parameter designated through the operator display (see page 5, lines 10-12 of the Office Action). Applicants disagree. Gibson shows at column 5, lines 35-44 that the other visual characteristics of the sphere, such as size, location, texture and density are made interdependent with selected audio characteristics of the source signal: i.e., the size of the sphere is correlated to frequency and amplitude; the x-location of the sphere is correlated to signal balance or pan control; the y-location of the sphere is correlated to frequency; the z-location of the sphere is correlated to volume or amplitude; the texture of the sphere is correlated to certain effects and/or waveform information; and the density of the sphere is correlated to amplitude. Thus, the sphere is variably displayed depending on the audio characteristics of the sound signal itself. The distance between the sound source and the

listener is not a characteristic of the sound signal itself, but is instead one of acoustic field characteristics. Gibson does not teach or suggest that the image display variably displays image data depending on the value of the parameter reflecting the distance characteristic parameter designated through the operator display.

Further, the position was taken in the Office Action that Ashour teaches an operator display for displaying, for each of the parameter types, a parameter operator to indicate a value of a parameter reflecting a distance characteristic parameter to determine an acoustic characteristic obtained by distance between a listener and a sound source (page 4, lines 17-21 of the Office Action). In Ashour's invention, the distance (rm) between the sound source and the listener is used to ensure the sound volume factors are proportional to $1/rm$ (column 4, lines 64-65). However, Ashour does not teach or suggest images that variably displayed depending on the distance rm.

Fujishita also does not teach or suggest images that are variably displayed depending on the distance between the sound source and the listener.

The other independent claims recite a feature substantially similar to that discussed above in connection with claim 1 and are believed patentable for substantially similar reasons.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Dated: March 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa
Joseph W. Ragusa

Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant